Case 3:05-cv-00288-TMB Document 12 Filed 04/03/2006 Page 1 of 3 DOUGLAS R. DAVIS 1 KEESAL. YOUNG & LOGAN 1029 West Third Avenue, Suite 650 2 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1954 doug.davis@kvl.com 3 Telephone: (907) 279-9696 Facsimile: (907) 279-4239 4 5 Attorneys for Crowley Marine Services, Inc. 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA 9 10 GARY J. CROCHET, Case No. 3:05-cv-0288-TMB 11 Plaintiff. 12 VS. 13 CROWLEY MARINE SERVICES. INC. MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF 14 MOTION TO AMEND ANSWER Defendant. 15 16 17 18 19 Defendant Crowley Marine Services, Inc. ("Crowley") seeks leave to 20 amend its answer to assert an additional affirmative defense that certain claims 21 by plaintiff are pre-empted by operation of law in accordance with §301 of the 22 Labor Relations Management Act, 29 U.S.C. §185, and that these claims are 23 barred by the six month statute of limitations which applies to such claims. (A 24 copy of Crowley's proposed amended answer is attached as Exhibit A. See 25 Affirmative Defense 9.) This is the first amendment of its answer sought by 26 defendant Crowley, and since no discovery has yet taken place in this matter,

amendment of the answer at this early date will not result in prejudice, and will facilitate the determination of this case on its merits.¹

Under Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a), leave of court to amend a pleading "shall be freely given when justice so requires." Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a); Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 83 S.Ct. 227, 9 L.Ed.2d 222 (1962). In Foman, the Supreme Court held that the mandate of Rule 15(a) is to be heeded, and a party should be afforded the opportunity to test its claims or defenses on the merits in the absence of any undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive, or repeated failure to cure any deficiencies by amendments previously allowed. Likewise, amendment should be granted in the absence of undue prejudice to an opposing party, or in the absence of futility of amendment. The courts have held that this policy is "to be applied with extreme liberality." Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose, 893 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9th Cir. 1990); Owens v. Keiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001); Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1051 – 52 (9th Cir. 2003). None of the exceptions identified by the Supreme Court in Foman apply in this case, and the proposed amendment should be allowed.

It is the consideration of prejudice to an opposing party which carries the greatest weight in consideration of whether to allow an amendment under Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a). Eminence Capital, supra, at 1052. Absent a strong showing of prejudice or any of the other remaining Foman factors, there exists a

has been filed well within any deadline for amendment of pleadings.

¹ The parties have agreed in their Scheduling and Planning Conference Report filed on February 23, 2006 that the cutoff date for motions to amend their pleadings would be set according to the D.Ak. LR 16.1(c) which is 60 days after the Pretrial Scheduling Order is entered by the Court. Thus, the present motion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26